



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/673,122

09/26/2003

Yuichi Ikeda

17057

1307

23389 7590 05/21/2007
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

KASZTEJNA, MATTHEW JOHN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3739

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,122

Applicant(s)

IKEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J. Kasztejna

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,9,15,16 and 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,9,15,16,18-20 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Notice of Amendment

In response to the amendment filed on March 2, 2007, amended claims 1 and 18-21 are acknowledged. The following reiterated grounds of rejection are set forth:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 15, 16, 18-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,982,725 to Hibino et al.

In regards to claim 1, Hibino et al. disclose an electric bending endoscope comprising: a bending portion 508 arranged to an inserting portion 504; a first unit 663 which has a frame unit and which holds a motor 686 that generates driving force for bending the bending portion; and a buffering member to connect a main frame 503 to which is connected the inserting portion and the frame unit, the buffering member has a first end connected to the frame unit and a second end connected to the main frame, so that a force applied to the inserting portion by an external operation may be absorbed between the first and the second end. (see Figs. 16 and 18 and Col. 46, Line 40 - Col. 47, Line 67).

In regards to claim 15, Hibino et al. disclose an electric bending endoscope, wherein the operating portion is provided with a switch 505 for operating the electric bending endoscope (see Fig. 18).

In regards to claims 16 and 19, Hibino et al. disclose an electric bending endoscope wherein the unit comprises an inner frame for holding the motor and an outer frame for holding the inner frame (see Fig. 18).

In regards to claims 18 and 20, Hibino et al. disclose an electric bending endoscope comprising: a bending portion 508 arranged to an inserting portion 504; a first unit 663 which has a frame unit which holds a motor 686 that generates driving force for bending the bending portion; a second unit 503 which is separable from the first unit and which has a transmitting member 510 for transmitting the driving force of the motor to the bending portion, the second unit having a main frame to which is connected the inserting portion; and a buffering member to connect the main frame and the frame unit, the buffering member has a first end connected to the frame unit and a second end connected to the main frame, so that a force applied to the inserting portion by an external operation may be absorbed between the first and the second end (see Figs. 16 and 18 and Col. 46, Line 40 - Col. 47, Line 67).

In regard to claim 22, Hibino et al. disclose an electric bending endoscope, further comprising an operating portion connected to the first unit for operating the electric bending endoscope, wherein a wheel is arranged to a driving shaft of a driving force transmitting member of the second unit, and a rotating shaft of the wheel is arranged in front of the operating portion on a side cross-section of the operating portion

Art Unit: 3739

in the electric bending endoscope, with respect to the central axis of the inserting portion (see Figs 1 and 34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-9 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,982,725 to Hibino et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,609,563 to Suzuki et al.

In regard to claims 8-9 and 23-24, Hibino et al. disclose an electric bending endoscope having an operation lever 16 arranged to the operating portion for operating the bending driving unit, but are silent with respect to an angle formed between the center axis of the inserting portion in the electric bending endoscope and the center axis of the operation lever at the neutral position thereof, and the angle is (120-150 degrees), an inclined angle of the operation lever is +/- 30 degrees from the center of the operation lever, and the inclined center position of the operation lever is arranged in front of the operating portion, with respect to the center position of the inserting portion in the electric bending endoscope. Suzuki et al. teach of an analogous electric bending endoscope wherein the operating portion of the endoscope is formed between the center axis of the inserting portion and the center axis of the operation lever as seen in Figs. 1 and 4. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the

invention was made to construct the operating portion of the apparatus of Hibino et al. at an angle in order to provide a more comfortable fitting during use for the operator of the instrument as taught by Suzuki et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 21 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 2, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant states that Hibino et al. fails to suggest that the first unit and second unit are separate. However, Hibino et al. clearly states that the second unit 503 of the endoscope 501 is removably connected to the first unit 663 (see Col. 46, Lines 48-52). Thus, Hibino et al. teaches of a second unit separable from the first unit, as claimed in the instant invention. The removable connection between the video processor (i.e. the first unit 663 which has a frame unit which holds a motor 686) and the connector (i.e. the second unit 503 having a main frame and a transmitting member 510) meet the limitations of the claims in their broadest interpretation. Furthermore, a removable connector is shown as being relay cord 665 (see Figure 16), which may be interpreted as being the buffering member that has a first end connected to the frame unit of the first unit 663 and a second end connected to the main frame of the second unit 503, so

Art Unit: 3739

that a force applied to the inserting portion by an external operation may be absorbed between the first and the second end.

Applicant also states that Hibino et al. fails to suggest a buffering member that absorbs external force applied to the inserting portion. However, as broadly as claimed, the connecting portion which removably connects the first unit 663 to the second unit 503 (see Col. 46, Lines 48-52) acts as buffering member, in a similar fashion to the instant invention wherein the connecting member 16 acts as a buffering member as clarified in the applicants arguments filed June 16, 2006 (page 7, line 11).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Kasztejna whose telephone number is (571) 272-6086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-6:00.


Art Unit: 3739

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C.M. Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJK 

5/9/07



LINDA C. M. DVORAK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP.3700